

## EXHIBIT 12

### BROWN DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO EXCLUDE

Deposition of Ranna Prajapati

In Re: HIGH-TECH EMPLOYEE ANTITRUST LITIGATION

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
3 SAN JOSE DIVISION  
4

5 IN RE: HIGH-TECH EMPLOYEE )  
6 ANTITRUST LITIGATION )  
7 ) No. 11-CV-2509-LHK  
8 THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO: )  
9 ALL ACTIONS. )  
10 \_\_\_\_\_ )  
11

12 DEPOSITION OF RANNA PRAJAPATI  
13 Thursday, February 21, 2013  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 Reported By:  
25 KATHLEEN WILKINS, CSR #10068, RPR-RMR-CRR-CCRR-CLR

11:13:21 1 on joint projects) might happen

11:13:23 2 again."

11:13:29 3 Q. Do you, in your own mind, as you sit  
11:13:31 4 here today, recall seeing or receiving such a  
11:13:36 5 communication?

11:13:37 6 MR. SHAH: Objection. Again, you're  
11:13:41 7 quoting from a document which you haven't shown to  
11:13:43 8 the witness, and so lacks foundation. And also,  
11:13:49 9 the document speaks for itself.

11:13:53 10 THE WITNESS: May I refer to the  
11:13:54 11 document?

11:13:57 12 BY MR. DALLAL:

11:13:57 13 Q. You can refer to the document if you  
11:13:59 14 like. It's quoting the document. But the  
11:14:01 15 question is whether you recall seeing or receiving  
11:14:05 16 such a communication.

11:14:09 17 MR. SHAH: I have the same objection.

11:14:11 18 THE WITNESS: Yes.

11:14:12 19 BY MR. DALLAL:

11:14:19 20 Q. And when you recall seeing or receiving  
11:14:21 21 such a communication, do you recall seeing or  
11:14:27 22 receiving communication from the Pixar complainant  
11:14:33 23 directly, or from an Intel employee reporting on a  
11:14:38 24 conversation with a Pixar complainant?

11:14:40 25 MR. SHAH: Objection. Again, you're

11:14:44 1 asking about a quote from a document that you  
11:14:47 2 haven't shown to the witness, so lacks foundation.  
11:14:51 3 And the document speaks for itself.

11:14:59 4 THE WITNESS: Yes, I remember it.

11:15:02 5 BY MR. DALLAL:

11:15:02 6 Q. Do you recall whether you saw a  
11:15:05 7 communication from a Pixar complainant or from an  
11:15:10 8 Intel employee reporting on a conversation with a  
11:15:12 9 Pixar complainant, or do you not recall either  
11:15:17 10 way?

11:15:17 11 MR. SHAH: Same objection.

11:15:19 12 THE WITNESS: I -- I recall on an Intel  
11:15:22 13 employee.

11:15:23 14 BY MR. DALLAL:

11:15:36 15 Q. So is it your understanding that if  
11:15:43 16 Intel agreed not to employ cold calling in  
11:15:50 17 attempts to recruit Pixar employees, that Intel  
11:15:55 18 would have a better chance of collaborating  
11:16:00 19 further or working further with Pixar?

11:16:03 20 MR. SHAH: Objection. Assumes facts not  
11:16:05 21 in evidence. Lacks foundation and calls for a  
11:16:11 22 legal conclusion.

11:16:19 23 THE WITNESS: So my goal was to preserve  
11:16:21 24 the collaboration, or goals to preserve the  
11:16:25 25 collaborative efforts and just maintain that.

11:16:28 1 BY MR. DALLAL:

11:16:29 2 Q. And was it your understanding that Intel  
11:16:34 3 not using cold calling to recruit Pixar employees  
11:16:41 4 would support the purpose of protecting the  
11:16:50 5 collaboration?

11:16:52 6 MR. SHAH: Objection. Calls for a legal  
11:16:53 7 conclusion. Lacks foundation.

11:16:58 8 THE WITNESS: Yes. As it was focused on  
11:16:59 9 a specific team, the RenderMan team.

11:17:16 10 BY MR. DALLAL:

11:17:17 11 Q. So in what way would such a policy  
11:17:23 12 support the purpose of preserving the  
11:17:26 13 collaborative efforts between Intel and Pixar?

11:17:32 14 MR. SHAH: Objection. Vague and  
11:17:32 15 ambiguous.

11:17:37 16 THE WITNESS: Can you rephrase the  
11:17:38 17 question? What exactly are you -- I'm sorry. I  
11:17:43 18 didn't understand, like --

11:17:47 19 BY MR. DALLAL:

11:17:47 20 Q. That's okay. I can rephrase.

11:18:11 21 Given your stated goal of preserving the  
11:18:15 22 collaboration between Intel and Pixar, my question  
11:18:20 23 is, how would a policy of not using cold calling  
11:18:27 24 to recruit Pixar employees serve that purpose?

11:18:33 25 MR. SHAH: Objection. Vague and

11:18:34 1 ambiguous. Mischaracterizes previous testimony.

11:18:41 2 THE WITNESS: It's helping to preserve

11:18:44 3 the relationship. I mean, and it's not -- as I

11:18:49 4 mentioned before, it wasn't -- it was an ask by

11:18:52 5 them to not cold call, in particular, people from

11:19:01 6 a specific team that was small to begin with, and

11:19:04 7 people that we had been collaborating with on

11:19:07 8 getting feedback on Larrabee, for example. It

11:19:10 9 just helps, you know, maintain the relationship

11:19:13 10 and continue the collaborative efforts versus just

11:19:18 11 stopping them.

11:19:18 12 BY MR. DALLAL:

11:19:23 13 Q. And when you say "an ask," that refers

11:19:27 14 to a request?

11:19:29 15 A. A request.

11:19:30 16 Q. Okay. So is it fair to say that you

11:19:45 17 thought that honoring their request would help

11:19:49 18 preserve the relationship?

11:19:52 19 MR. SHAH: Objection. Vague and

11:19:54 20 ambiguous.

11:19:59 21 THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes, I did.

11:20:30 22 MS. RICHARDSON: I'm sorry to interrupt,

11:20:30 23 but could the witness just speak up a bit? It's

11:20:33 24 hard to hear over the phone.

11:20:35 25 THE WITNESS: Sure. Can you hear me

02:17:52 1 A. No. Just to be aware that there was  
02:17:54 2 somebody within Intel who was going to give Greg  
02:17:59 3 Brandeau a call and that I would like to know, you  
02:18:01 4 know, the context of that call.

02:18:03 5 Q. Okay. Why was somebody going to give  
02:18:06 6 Greg Brandeau a call?

02:18:11 7 MR. SHAH: Object to the form of the  
02:18:11 8 question.

02:18:11 9 Are you talking about this specific  
02:18:13 10 e-mail?

02:18:16 11 MR. DALLAL: Well, I'm talking about the  
02:18:19 12 specific call that's contemplated, yes.

02:18:21 13 MR. SHAH: In this e-mail?

02:18:23 14 MR. DALLAL: Yes.

02:18:23 15 MR. SHAH: Okay.

02:18:29 16 THE WITNESS: So, I'm sorry, the  
02:18:30 17 question was, did I know the specifics of this  
02:18:32 18 call?

02:18:34 19 BY MR. DALLAL:

02:18:34 20 Q. No.

02:18:34 21 The question is why was somebody  
02:18:40 22 going -- somebody at Intel going to give Greg  
02:18:44 23 Brandeau a call?

02:18:47 24 A. To address his concerns about another  
02:18:51 25 incident that had happened with regards to hiring.

Deposition of Ranna Prajapati

In Re: HIGH-TECH EMPLOYEE ANTITRUST LITIGATION

02:18:59 1 Q. Okay. Do you recall any specifics about  
02:19:03 2 that incident?

02:19:09 3 MR. SHAH: Object to form. Vague and  
02:19:11 4 ambiguous.

02:19:15 5 THE WITNESS: Yes.

02:19:16 6 BY MR. DALLAL:

02:19:16 7 Q. All right. Please describe the incident  
02:19:18 8 to which you're referring.

02:19:23 9 A. I received a call from Greg Brandeau  
02:19:27 10 citing concerns about Intel possibly hiring a few  
02:19:34 11 of the folks from the RenderMan team.

02:19:41 12 Q. Okay. Was Intel at that time under any  
02:19:44 13 obligation not to hire people from Pixar or the  
02:19:50 14 RenderMan team?

02:19:51 15 MR. SHAH: Objection. Lacks foundation.  
02:19:54 16 Vague and ambiguous.

02:19:57 17 THE WITNESS: No.

02:20:25 18 BY MR. DALLAL:

02:20:25 19 Q. So if Intel was not so obligated, why  
02:20:36 20 did you want to call or have someone at Intel call  
02:20:40 21 Greg Brandeau to address his concerns?

02:20:44 22 MR. SHAH: Objection. Mischaracterizes  
02:20:46 23 previous testimony or assumes facts not in  
02:20:48 24 evidence.

02:20:57 25 THE WITNESS: I didn't have this



02:20:59 1 gentleman, Jay Connelly, call him on my behalf.

02:21:02 2 He wanted to reach out to Greg and call on his

02:21:05 3 behalf. So I don't know what motivated why, other

02:21:08 4 than for Greg not to reach out to our executives

02:21:13 5 directly before we had the full -- the facts on

02:21:15 6 what was going on.

02:21:31 7 BY MR. DALLAL:

02:21:32 8 Q. So if you look at the top e-mail, which

02:21:33 9 appears to be Jay Connelly's forward to you, he

02:21:43 10 states:

02:21:43 11 "Ranna, I know Greg and would

02:21:45 12 like to give him a ring to diffuse

02:21:47 13 his concerns before he starts

02:21:49 14 calling Pat or Renee. All the

02:21:52 15 ex-Pixar folks have come to my

02:21:54 16 group, so it makes sense. Message

02:21:56 17 is that we have only hired two

02:21:59 18 Pixar heads, and in both cases

02:22:00 19 they came to us based on long-term

02:22:03 20 relationships with Matt and Craig.

02:22:05 21 Makes sense?"

02:22:14 22 So first of all, when you received this

02:22:16 23 e-mail -- well, all right, first of all, did you

02:22:21 24 receive this e-mail?

02:22:23 25 A. Yes.

02:22:24 1 Q. Okay. And then when you received this  
02:22:25 2 e-mail, did you interpret Pat to mean Pat  
02:22:30 3 Gelsinger?

02:22:35 4 A. Yes.

02:22:35 5 Q. And Renee to mean Renee James?

02:22:38 6 A. Yes.

02:22:42 7 Q. Okay. So at the time, was Mr. Gelsinger  
02:22:57 8 in your direct chain of command?

02:23:02 9 A. No.

02:23:16 10 Q. Do you recall if you responded to  
02:23:17 11 Mr. Connelly?

02:23:23 12 A. I don't remember. If I -- either it was  
02:23:32 13 via e-mail that I don't remember or via phone, I  
02:23:35 14 picked up the phone and called him. I don't  
02:23:37 15 remember.

02:23:38 16 Q. One way or the other?

02:23:39 17 A. Yes.

02:23:52 18 MR. DALLAL: Okay. Set that aside.  
02:23:54 19 Please mark the next one.

02:23:55 20 (Whereupon, Deposition Exhibit 994 was  
02:23:55 21 marked for identification.)

02:23:57 22 BY MR. DALLAL:

02:24:05 23 Q. Okay. I've handed you Exhibit 994.  
02:24:07 24 It's a two-page document beginning with  
02:24:10 25 76600DOC000051.

02:24:31 1 A. Okay.

02:24:36 2 Q. So does this -- well, do you recognize  
02:24:39 3 this document?

02:24:40 4 A. I do.

02:24:41 5 Q. Okay. And it appears to be, in part, an  
02:24:47 6 e-mail chain between you and Jay Connelly.

02:24:52 7 Did you send the e-mails that the  
02:24:56 8 document indicates he was sending and receive the  
02:24:59 9 ones that it indicates he was receiving?

02:25:00 10 A. Yes.

02:25:01 11 Q. Okay. So does this refresh your  
02:25:11 12 recollection as to whether or not you contacted --

02:25:14 13 A. Yes.

02:25:14 14 Q. -- Jay Connelly?

02:25:17 15 Okay. And so it appears there was some  
02:25:33 16 confusion about the phone number.

02:25:38 17 A. Yes.

02:25:41 18 Q. So if you go to the second page, and  
02:25:44 19 it's -- unfortunately, it's broken across the page  
02:25:47 20 break.

02:25:48 21 A. Mh-hmm.

02:25:50 22 Q. So it's your -- the prior page indicates  
02:25:52 23 it's an e-mail from you to Jay Connelly, and it  
02:25:55 24 says, "Hi Jay."

02:25:56 25 And then you say:

02:25:57 1 "Thank you so much for  
02:25:58 2 reaching out to me and letting me  
02:26:00 3 know you'd be willing to call him.  
02:26:03 4 Yes, after Greg B. had informed he  
02:26:05 5 was going to send an e-mail to  
02:26:07 6 either Pat or Justin regarding why  
02:26:10 7 was 'Intel recruiting from our  
02:26:14 8 RenderMan team,' I wanted to  
02:26:17 9 understand the details prior to  
02:26:19 10 responding to this claim. And if  
02:26:21 11 these folks are in your group, I  
02:26:22 12 think it would be better if the  
02:26:24 13 messaging comes from you."

02:26:27 14 You provide a number. You say, "Please  
02:26:29 15 let me know how your conversation goes."

02:26:45 16 So when you said, "I wanted to  
02:26:48 17 understand the details prior to responding to this  
02:26:51 18 claim," what did you mean by "responding to this  
02:26:57 19 claim"?

02:27:02 20 A. In my phone conversation with Greg  
02:27:04 21 Brandeau when he called me up to inform me or ask  
02:27:08 22 me what was going on, it caught me off guard  
02:27:10 23 because I didn't know this was going on within  
02:27:13 24 Pixar.

02:27:14 25 I had no knowledge of -- prior knowledge

02:27:15 1 of it, and I wanted to understand what group  
02:27:18 2 within Intel was, you know -- that he was  
02:27:21 3 referring to or who was hiring from Intel and what  
02:27:28 4 group these people were going into and just --  
02:27:32 5 just background information, because I was caught  
02:27:35 6 off guard.

02:27:37 7 Q. Okay.

02:27:39 8 A. So because the couple individuals that  
02:27:41 9 Jay is referring to within this e-mail are within  
02:27:43 10 his organization, that helped make a little more  
02:27:46 11 sense. But before responding back in any formal  
02:27:48 12 manner to Greg, I wanted to make sure I had done  
02:27:51 13 my homework and got the facts before saying  
02:27:54 14 anything.

02:27:57 15 Q. So when you say you were caught off  
02:28:00 16 guard, were you surprised that Intel might be  
02:28:05 17 hiring Pixar employees?

02:28:10 18 A. I didn't know, so yes.

02:28:20 19 Q. Did that worry you?

02:28:28 20 A. Worry me how? Worry just in general?  
02:28:31 21 Worry about my account management or --

02:28:36 22 Q. About anything.

02:28:41 23 A. A little bit, yes.

02:28:43 24 Q. So in what way were you worried by  
02:28:47 25 learning that Intel might be hiring Pixar

02:28:52 1 employees?

02:28:53 2 A. In that it might have an effect on the  
02:29:00 3 various collaborative relationships, you know, we  
02:29:02 4 have going on with Pixar from an engineering  
02:29:05 5 standpoint and just preserving the relationship in  
02:29:11 6 all.

02:29:12 7 And, you know, we get very valuable  
02:29:13 8 feedback from them that we can, you know, put  
02:29:17 9 towards our emerging technologies. So that's what  
02:29:20 10 I was worried about.

02:29:22 11 Q. Did you regard Intel's hiring of Pixar  
02:29:26 12 employees as inappropriate?

02:29:30 13 MR. SHAH: Object to form.

02:29:37 14 THE WITNESS: No.

02:29:38 15 BY MR. DALLAL:

02:29:52 16 Q. So if you turn back to the first page,  
02:30:00 17 there's another -- there's -- the last e-mail from  
02:30:03 18 you, it's the second e-mail from the top of the  
02:30:06 19 page, the one on Friday, October 10 at 11:08 a.m.

02:30:12 20 Do you see that?

02:30:13 21 A. Mh-hmm.

02:30:14 22 Q. And the second line of that says:

02:30:16 23 "FYI, I met with Greg this  
02:30:19 24 morning and explained our position  
02:30:20 25 on this matter and informed him

02:30:22 1 you were going to call him. He is  
02:30:25 2 cool with everything, so we are  
02:30:26 3 good."

02:30:34 4 Do you recall talking with Greg Brandeau  
02:30:36 5 the morning of Friday, October 10th, 2008?

02:30:41 6 A. Yes.

02:30:43 7 Q. Do you recall how long you talked with  
02:30:44 8 him?

02:30:45 9 A. No.

02:30:47 10 Q. Do you recall what you discussed with  
02:30:48 11 him?

02:30:54 12 A. Vaguely.

02:30:56 13 Q. What was that?

02:30:57 14 A. Just that Jay Connelly was going to go  
02:31:01 15 ahead and give him a call, he understood the  
02:31:04 16 situation, and the individuals that Greg was  
02:31:06 17 referring to were within his organization. So Jay  
02:31:09 18 could provide a little bit more context around  
02:31:12 19 what was going on. And Greg was okay with that.

02:31:24 20 Q. So is it fair to say that you thought  
02:31:31 21 that it would be beneficial to have someone call  
02:31:37 22 Greg Brandeau in addition to you about this  
02:31:40 23 matter?

02:31:42 24 A. Yes.

02:31:43 25 Q. Okay. You can put that aside.

02:31:48 1 (Whereupon, Deposition Exhibit 995 was  
02:31:48 2 marked for identification.)

02:32:24 3 BY MR. DALLAL:

02:32:24 4 Q. I've just handed you Exhibit 995. It's  
02:32:27 5 a one-page document that begins with  
02:32:29 6 76600DOC000281 and ends with that number, for that  
02:32:37 7 matter.

02:32:39 8 So please let me know when you've had --

02:32:45 9 A. Yeah.

02:32:46 10 Q. -- a chance to read.

02:32:48 11 A. Yes.

02:32:49 12 Q. So if you look at the previous document  
02:33:03 13 again, it appears that your message  
02:33:09 14 asking -- strike that.

02:33:15 15 It appears that your message providing  
02:33:18 16 the number for Greg Brandeau to Jay Connelly  
02:33:23 17 which, in fact, wound up being the wrong number,  
02:33:28 18 neither here nor there, was sent on Thursday,  
02:33:33 19 October 9, at 5:35 p.m.

02:33:42 20 And then your e-mail to Mr. Connelly  
02:33:47 21 saying that you'd spoken on the phone with Greg  
02:33:49 22 was from 11:00 a.m. the following morning, Friday,  
02:33:54 23 October 10th, 2008.

02:34:02 24 So turning back to Exhibit 995, first of  
02:34:05 25 all, do you recognize this document?



02:34:07 1 A. Yes.

02:34:08 2 MR. SHAH: I'm going to object to the  
02:34:11 3 prelude to your question because I think you  
02:34:13 4 mischaracterized the document or misstated what  
02:34:16 5 was in the document.

02:34:17 6 MR. DALLAL: How so?

02:34:18 7 MR. SHAH: You said -- well, maybe I --  
02:34:23 8 you said that spoke on the phone with Greg  
02:34:26 9 Brandeau, and it says I met with Greg Brandeau --  
02:34:31 10 Greg this morning. So that's all.

02:34:33 11 MR. DALLAL: Okay.

02:34:43 12 Q. So Exhibit 995, did you receive this  
02:34:45 13 e-mail? Granted you were CC'd, but do you recall  
02:34:49 14 receiving it?

02:34:52 15 A. Yes.

02:34:52 16 Q. Okay. If you look at the time stamp, it  
02:35:02 17 is -- it states 10/10/2008, 12:30 a.m. So it  
02:35:08 18 appears this was sent very late Thursday night.

02:35:22 19 Do you recall if you read this e-mail  
02:35:23 20 prior to speaking with Mr. Brandeau on the morning  
02:35:32 21 of Friday the 10th?

02:35:33 22 A. Yes.

02:35:34 23 Q. All right. The e-mail reads -- and it's  
02:35:45 24 addressed to Pat Gelsinger.

02:35:48 25 "Hi Pat, Over the past 6-9

02:35:50 1 months, Intel has made offers to 3  
02:35:53 2 engineers who work in our  
02:35:54 3 RenderMan team. Given that Pixar  
02:35:56 4 and Intel do have a close  
02:35:59 5 relationship, could you ask the  
02:36:00 6 recruiters inside of Intel to  
02:36:02 7 please stop recruiting our people.  
02:36:05 8 I am not saying the crazy thing  
02:36:06 9 people at Pixar shouldn't be  
02:36:08 10 allowed to apply to job postings.  
02:36:11 11 I am simply asking that you don't  
02:36:13 12 cold call our people. Especially  
02:36:14 13 Dana's team which is only 15  
02:36:18 14 people in the first place!  
02:36:21 15 Thanks!"

02:36:47 16 So when you read the request, "could you  
02:36:51 17 ask the recruiters inside of Intel to please stop  
02:36:53 18 recruiting our people," or when you read that  
02:37:05 19 request at the time, did you take it to apply to  
02:37:17 20 all Pixar employees generally?

02:37:18 21 MR. SHAH: Objection. Calls for  
02:37:19 22 speculation.

02:37:23 23 THE WITNESS: No.

02:37:28 24 BY MR. DALLAL:

02:37:28 25 Q. So did you think the request was

02:37:31 1 limited?

02:37:33 2 A. Based on this e-mail, yes. It was  
02:37:34 3 limited.

02:37:36 4 Q. In what way?

02:37:37 5 A. My interpretation of it was limited  
02:37:42 6 based on his reference to the RenderMan team.

02:37:52 7 Q. So you're referring to in the prior  
02:37:54 8 sentence?

02:37:57 9 A. Yes. Yes.

02:38:14 10 Q. So to be clear, the first sentence says,  
02:38:17 11 "Over the past 6-9 months, Intel has made offers  
02:38:19 12 to 3 engineers who work in our RenderMan team."

02:38:24 13 And your testimony is that, based on  
02:38:30 14 that intro and within that context, the following  
02:38:35 15 sentence, "Given that Pixar and Intel do have a  
02:38:40 16 close relationship, could you ask the recruiters  
02:38:41 17 inside of Intel to please stop recruiting our  
02:38:45 18 people" is limited to only the RenderMan team?

02:38:48 19 MR. SHAH: Objection. Asked and  
02:38:49 20 answered.

02:38:50 21 THE WITNESS: That is my interpretation,  
02:38:51 22 yes.

02:39:05 23 BY MR. DALLAL:

02:39:05 24 Q. What did you think of this request when  
02:39:08 25 you read it?

02:39:16 1 A. I mean, if I were to interpret what he  
02:39:21 2 was -- he was saying, I mean, I interpret it as  
02:39:24 3 he's trying to preserve his team, he's trying to  
02:39:27 4 preserve his talent, and, I mean, I understand  
02:39:30 5 that. It's a very specific skill set that the  
02:39:34 6 folks in this group had. And he's also trying to  
02:39:42 7 preserve, you know, the working relationship or  
02:39:44 8 partnership.

02:39:51 9 Q. So is it fair to say you could see where  
02:39:53 10 he was coming from?

02:39:57 11 A. Yes.

02:40:02 12 Q. So you regarded this request as  
02:40:05 13 understandable?

02:40:07 14 MR. SHAH: Objection. Asked and  
02:40:07 15 answered.

02:40:10 16 THE WITNESS: What do you mean,  
02:40:10 17 "understandable"? I don't ...

02:40:17 18 BY MR. DALLAL:

02:40:24 19 Q. I'll ask a different question.

02:40:25 20 Did you regard this request as improper  
02:40:27 21 in any way?

02:40:30 22 MR. SHAH: Objection. Vague and  
02:40:31 23 ambiguous.

02:40:34 24 THE WITNESS: No.

02:40:46 25 BY MR. DALLAL:

02:40:46 1 Q. Did it upset you to receive this  
02:40:49 2 request?

02:41:01 3 A. It did upset me, because, once again, my  
02:41:04 4 goal is to manage and preserve the account  
02:41:07 5 relationship or the relationship between Intel and  
02:41:09 6 Pixar.

02:41:11 7 And, you know, my job is to do what's in  
02:41:15 8 the best interest of my customer, and if something  
02:41:18 9 like this is upsetting them, then I want to do  
02:41:23 10 whatever I can to ease that and, you know, make it  
02:41:25 11 go away if possible. Once again, you know, it's  
02:41:32 12 in the spirit of trying to conserve all the  
02:41:34 13 collaborative efforts that we have going on  
02:41:36 14 between two companies.

02:41:43 15 Q. Did this request strike you as unethical  
02:41:47 16 in any way?

02:41:48 17 MR. SHAH: Objection. Vague and  
02:41:49 18 ambiguous.

02:41:54 19 THE WITNESS: No.

02:41:56 20 BY MR. DALLAL:

02:41:59 21 Q. Okay. And granted that you're not a  
02:42:01 22 lawyer, and so I'm not entitled to try and box you  
02:42:09 23 into a particular position, legal position, but  
02:42:12 24 when you read this, did it strike you that this  
02:42:17 25 request might violate the law in some way?

05:41:04 1 MR. DALLAL: Okay.

05:41:05 2 EXAMINATION BY MR. SHAH

05:41:05 3 BY MR. SHAH:

05:41:06 4 Q. Could you turn to Exhibit 1004.

05:41:21 5 And my questions are about the e-mail

05:41:24 6 from Christina Dickenson where she refers to some

05:41:29 7 policies regarding recruiting from Pixar.

05:41:31 8 And I believe you testified earlier that

05:41:38 9 this was not -- the RenderMan team was not

05:41:43 10 mentioned in this e-mail, correct?

05:41:46 11 A. Yes.

05:41:49 12 Q. Did you think it was necessary to

05:41:50 13 specifically refer to the RenderMan team in

05:41:52 14 instructions like this?

05:41:54 15 A. No.

05:41:55 16 Q. Why not?

05:41:58 17 A. Because the type of skill set that Intel

05:42:01 18 was looking for for possible folks was they were

05:42:07 19 located -- or they were part of the RenderMan

05:42:09 20 team.

05:42:11 21 Q. Thank you.

05:42:12 22 Now, can you turn to Exhibit 1008?

05:42:30 23 A. This one?

05:42:32 24 Q. 1008.

05:42:35 25 A. Yes. Got it.

1 I, Kathleen A. Wilkins, Certified  
2 Shorthand Reporter licensed in the State of  
3 California, License No. 10068, hereby certify that  
4 the deponent was by me first duly sworn and the  
5 foregoing testimony was reported by me and was  
6 thereafter transcribed with computer-aided  
7 transcription; that the foregoing is a full,  
8 complete and true record of said proceedings.

9 I further certify that I am not of  
10 counsel or attorney for either of any of the  
11 parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption  
12 named or in any way interested in the outcome of  
13 the cause in said caption.

14 The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding  
15 of the original transcript will render the  
16 reporter's Certificates null and void.

17 In witness whereof, I have hereunto set  
18 my hand this day: March 4, 2013.

19 \_\_\_\_\_ Reading and Signing was requested.

20 \_\_\_\_\_ Reading and Signing was waived.

21  X  Reading and signing was not requested.

22 \_\_\_\_\_

23 KATHLEEN A. WILKINS

24 CSR 10068, RPR-RMR-CRR-CCRR-CLR

25